Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

021000 DEC 30 2002

No. 02-

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

STEFANO PESSINA,

Petitioner,

v.

JOE S. ROSSON, ELIZABETH G. ROSSON, GHENT W. ROSSON, TODD A. ROSSON, AND TREVOR J. ROSSON, INDIVIDUALLY,

Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

BRIAN S. GREIG*
SHERRARD L. HAYES
MARCY HOGAN GREER
REBECCA EDGAR MELTON
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.
600 Congress Avenue, Suite 2400
Austin, Texas 78701
(512) 474-5201

Counsel for Petitioner

* *Counsel of Record*

177654

COUNSEL PRESS
(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

46 pp

QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

Should an individual whose only relevant contacts with a forum are incurred transacting business on behalf of a present and solvent corporate defendant be considered to have established minimum contacts with that forum on an individual basis, and would that exercise of jurisdiction comport with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Question Presented for Review	i
Table of Contents	ii
Table of Cited Authorities	iv
Table of Appendices	x
Petition for Writ of Certiorari	1
Opinions Below	1
Statement of Jurisdiction	1
Constitutional Provision Involved	2
Statement of the Case	2
Reasons for Granting the Petition	4
I. The Exercise of Jurisdiction Over Employees Acting Only for Their Employers Violates Well-Established Principles of Due Process	5
A. The Minimum Contacts Requirement is Not Satisfied by Reliance on an Employee's Conduct on Behalf of His Employer	5

Contents

Page

B. Basing Jurisdiction on an Employee's Corporate Conduct Does Not Comport With Traditional Notions of Fair Play and Substantial Justice 6

II. This Case Squarely Presents the Broader Question Regarding Jurisdiction Over Employees as Individuals Left Open by the Court 9

A. The Court Should Further Define the Circumstances Under Which an Employee May Reasonably Expect to be Haled Into Court on an Individual Basis 9

B. This Important Jurisdictional Question Has Been Answered Differently by Various Courts 11

C. The Court Should Use This Opportunity to Provide Clarity for Foreign Corporate Employees 15

Conclusion 16

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES

Page

Cases:

Allen v. Toshiba Corp., 599 F. Supp. 381 (D.N.M. 1984) 13

Anderson v. Heartland Oil & Gas, Inc., 249 Kan. 458 (Kan. 1991) 14

Aquadrill, Inc. v. Environmental Compliance Consulting Servs., Inc., 558 N.W.2d 391 (Iowa 1997) 14

Asahi Metal Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Superior Court of Calif., 480 U.S. 102 (1987) 7, 8

Brown v. General Brick Sales Co., 39 S.W.3d 291 (Tex. App.—Ft. Worth 2001, no pet.) 13

Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz, 471 U.S. 462 (1985) 5

Calder v. Jones, 465 U.S. 783 (1984) 9, 10, 11, 12

Cantrell v. Extradition Corp. of Am., 789 F. Supp. 306 (W.D. Mo. 1992) 15

Christian Book Distributors, Inc. v. Great Christian Books, Inc., 768 A.2d 719 (Md. Ct. Spec. App. 2001) 13

Cited Authorities

	Page
Columbia Briargate Co. v. First Nat'l Bank, 713 F.2d 1052 (4th Cir. 1983)	13
CSR Ltd. v. Link, 925 S.W.2d 591 (Tex. 1996)	11
Davis v. Metro Productions, Inc., 885 F.2d 515 (9th Cir. 1989)	14
Doe v. Thompson, 620 So. 2d 1004 (Fla. 1993)	13
Escoto v. U. S. Lending Corp., 675 So. 2d 741 (La. Ct. App. 1996)	14
Estabrook v. Wetmore, 529 A.2d 956 (N.H. 1987)	14
Flocco v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 752 A.2d 147 (D.C. 2000)	13
Fryar v. Westside Habilitation Ctr., 479 So. 2d 883 (La. 1985)	14
Hanson v. Denckla, 357 U.S. 235 (1958)	5
Hoag v. Sweetwater Int'l, 857 F. Supp. 1420 (D. Nev. 1994)	13
Holste v. Burlington Northern R.R., 592 N.W.2d 894 (Neb. 1999)	14
Idaho Potato Comm'n v. Washington Potato Comm'n, 410 F. Supp. 171 (D. Idaho 1975)	13

Cited Authorities

	Page
Int'l Shoe Co. v. Washington, 326 U.S. 310 (1945) ..	5, 6
Intermatic Inc. v. Taymac Corp., 815 F. Supp. 290 (S.D. Ind. 1993)	14
Kreutter v. McFadden Oil Corp., 522 N.E.2d 40 (N.Y. 1988)	14
Marine Midland Bank v. Miller, 664 F.2d 899 (2d Cir. 1981)	11, 13
McClelland v. Watling Ladder Co., 729 F. Supp. 1316 (W.D. Okla. 1990)	13
Mobil Oil Corp. v. Advanced Envtl. Recycling Techns., Inc., 833 F. Supp. 437 (D. Del. 1993)	14
Oakridge Holdings, Inc. v. Brukman, 528 N.W.2d 274 (Minn. Ct. App. 1995)	15
Office Dimensions—Louisiana, Inc. v. King, 718 So. 2d 1052 (La. Ct. App. 1998)	14-15
Principal Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. Glick, 1994 WL 878819 (Mass. Super. Ct. Dec. 14, 1994)	14
Rollins v. Ellwood, 565 N.E.2d 1302 (Ill. 1990) ...	13
Rush v. Savchuk, 444 U.S. 320 (1980)	5

Cited Authorities

Page

Ryan v. Chayes Virginia, Inc., 553 N.E.2d 1237 (Ind. Ct. App. 1990) 14

Saktides v. Cooper, 742 F. Supp. 382 (W.D. Tex. 1990) 11, 13

Seiber v. Campbell, 810 So. 2d 641 (Ala. 2001) ... 14

Shapolsky v. Brewton, 56 S.W.3d 120 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2001, pet. denied) 11

Springs Indus., Inc. v. Gasson, 923 F. Supp. 823 (D. S.C. 1996) 14

State ex rel. Miller v. Baxter Chrysler Plymouth, Inc., 456 N.W.2d 371 (Iowa 1990) 14

State ex rel. Miller v. Moneda Corp., 1997 Iowa Sup. LEXIS 343 (Iowa 1997) 14

Stuart v. Federal Energy Sys., Inc., 596 F. Supp. 458 (D. Vt. 1984) 13

Stuart v. Spademan, 772 F.2d 1185 (5th Cir. 1985) 11, 13

Sudduth v. Howard, 646 So. 2d 664 (Ala. 1994) 14

Superior Consulting Co., Inc. v. Walling, 851 F. Supp. 839 (E.D. Mich. 1994) 14

Cited Authorities

Page

Taylor-Rush v. Multitech Corp., 265 Cal. Rptr. 672 (Cal. Ct. App. 1990) 14

Torchmark Corp. v. Rice, 945 F. Supp. 172 (E.D. Ark 1996) 14

Violanti v. Emery Worldwide, 847 F. Supp. 1251 (M.D. Penn. 1994) 13

Weller v. Cromwell Oil Co., 504 F.2d 927 (6th Cir. 1974) 13

Whalen v. Connelly, 545 N.W.2d 284 (Iowa 1996) ... 14

Wilshire Oil Co. v. Riffe, 409 F.2d 1277 (10th Cir. 1969) 13

World-Wide Volkswagen Corp. v. Woodson, 444 U.S. 286 (1980) 5, 7, 10

United States Constitution:

Fourteenth Amendment 2

Statute:

28 U.S.C. § 1257(a) 1

Cited Authorities

Page

Rules:

SUP. CT. RULE 10(b) 4

SUP. CT. RULE 10(c) 4

Other Authority:

Sonal N. Mehta, *Pavlovich v. Super. Ct. of Santa Clara Cty.*, 17 Berkeley Tech. L.J. 337 15

TABLE OF APPENDICES

Page

Appendix A — Letter From The Supreme Court Of Texas To Brian S. Greig, Esq. And Thomas W. Pirtle, Esq. Denying The Motion For Rehearing Dated October 10, 2002, Received October 14, 2002 ..... 1a

Appendix B — Opinion Of The Third District Court Of Appeals Of Texas Dated November 15, 2001 ..... 3a

Appendix C — Order Of The District Court Of Travis County, Texas Dated April 11, 2001 ..... 15a

Appendix D — Letter From The Supreme Court Of Texas To Brian S. Greig, Esq. And Thomas W. Pirtle, Esq. Denying Petition For Review Dated August 22, 2002 ..... 17a

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Stefano Pessina files this Petition for Writ of Certiorari to review the decision of the Texas Court of Appeals, Third Judicial District, in this case.

OPINIONS BELOW

The district court's order is unpublished and was rendered in: Cause No. GN0—1419; *Joe S. Rosson, et al. v. Rx.com, Inc., et al.*, In the District Court of Travis County, Texas, 201st Judicial District. *See* App. at 15a. The opinion of the court of appeals was handed down in: Cause No. 01-00204-CV; *Stefano Pessina v. Joe S. Rosson; Elizabeth G. Rosson; Ghent W. Rosson; Todd A. Rosson; and Trevor J. Rosson, Individually*; In the Texas Court of Appeals, Third Judicial District. *See* App. at 3a. The court of appeals' opinion was published and is reported as *Pessina v. Rosson*, 77 S.W.3d 293 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, pet. denied).

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Texas Court of Appeals, Third Judicial District, sought to be reviewed was entered on November 15, 2001. A petition for review was filed with the Texas Supreme Court on February 4, 2002, and was denied on August 22, 2002. *See* App. at 17a. A motion for rehearing was filed with the Texas Supreme Court on September 6, 2002, and was denied on October 10, 2002. *See* App. at 1a. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION INVOLVED

The Due Process Clause, Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, states:

> . . . [N]or shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law . . . ."

U.S. CONST. amend. XIV, § 2.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Stefano Pessina, a resident of Monaco and a citizen of Italy, is Chief Executive of Alliance Unichem PLC, a corporation of the United Kingdom with corporate offices in England. Alliance Unichem sent Mr. Pessina to Texas fewer than five times to act as its representative in negotiations with Rx.com, a now defunct Internet pharmacy that was based in Texas. The founder of Rx.com was Joe Rosson, one of the plaintiffs in this matter. At Rosson's invitation, and at the behest of Alliance Unichem, Mr. Pessina traveled to Texas solely for the purpose of representing Alliance in the negotiations with Rx.com. These business negotiations ultimately led to several agreements between Rx.com and Alliance Unichem, generally related to lines of credit and convertible notes. Mr. Pessina did not individually invest in Rx.com or otherwise participate or benefit personally from these agreements. Rather, all of the written agreements that are the subject of the underlying lawsuit were executed by Alliance Unichem, with employees other than Mr. Pessina signing on behalf of the company.

Rx.com failed as a business venture. The Rossons subsequently filed suit against Rx.com, Alliance Unichem, and several individual defendants in state district court in Travis County, Texas. Mr. Pessina contested the Texas court's personal jurisdiction over him by filing a special appearance as authorized by Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 120a, because all of the alleged contacts relevant to the specific jurisdiction alleged by the Rossons were made in his capacity as an employee of Alliance Unichem.

At the time of the special appearance, the live pleading[1] was the Plaintiffs' Third Amended Petition. The only pleading allegations concerning Mr. Pessina in that pleading pertain to Mr. Pessina's conduct on behalf of Alliance Unichem:

> Rx.com (through Joe Rosson and senior management of Rx.com) and ***Alliance (through Defendants Mills and Pessina)*** met repeatedly and negotiated the terms under which Alliance would provide financing and enter into the European Joint Venture. Ultimately, in December 1999, ***Alliance agreed*** to provide Rx.com with financing.

Third Amended Petition, ¶27 (emphasis added).[2]

---

1. Also on file at the time of the hearing was an affidavit from Joe Rosson (the "Rosson Affidavit"), in which he further detailed the allegations of corporate conduct regarding Mr. Pessina, as well as set out several instances of alleged personal conduct by Mr. Pessina. These personal allegations were wholly outside of the scope of the claims alleged in the lawsuit and were thus irrelevant to the assertion of specific jurisdiction over Mr. Pessina.

2. At the special appearance hearing, the trial court questioned the fact that the live pleading (the Third Amended Petition) contained no allegations of specific conduct by Mr. Pessina. In response, counsel

(Cont'd)

Notwithstanding his lack of personal—as opposed to professional—involvement in the transaction sued upon, the trial court denied the special appearance and found personal jurisdiction over Mr. Pessina. *See* App. at 16a. Mr. Pessina filed an interlocutory appeal, but the denial of his special appearance was affirmed by the Texas Third Court of Appeals. *See* App. at 14a. The Supreme Court of Texas denied Mr. Pessina's petition for review of the appellate court's ruling, as well as his motion for rehearing of that petition. *See* App. at 18a and 2a, respectively.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

This case provides an appropriate vehicle to address fundamental questions of federal law concerning the constitutionality of exercising jurisdiction over employees (as opposed to their corporate employers) where the only relevant contacts of those employees with a given forum are the actions they took on behalf of, and at the behest of, their employer. This question is of vital importance both jurisprudentially and in practical terms to our national and international commerce, yet it has not been settled by this Court. *See* SUP. CT. RULE 10(c). In the absence of clear direction from this Court, tremendous variation has developed among (and even within) the states and federal jurisdictions regarding the propriety of jurisdiction over such employees. *See* SUP. CT. RULE 10(b).

(Cont'd)
for the Rossons asked for leave to amend (again), and though Mr. Pessina objected and no leave was given, filed a Fourth Amended Petition the next day. However, even this amended pleading only fleshed out the Rossons' claims as to Mr. Pessina's conduct as a representative of Alliance Unichem. It did not add claims concerning any of the allegations of personal acts from the Rosson affidavit.

I. The Exercise of Jurisdiction Over Employees Acting Only for Their Employers Violates Well-Established Principles of Due Process

In order for a state to exercise personal jurisdiction over an individual or corporation, the standard is the same. There must be minimum contacts with the forum "such that the maintenance of the suit does not offend 'traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.'" *Int'l Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310, 316 (1945). This principle has been interpreted as a two part test: (1) whether the nonresident defendant has purposely established minimum contacts with the forum state; and (2) if so, whether the exercise of jurisdiction comports with traditional notions of "fair play and substantial justice." *Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz*, 471 U.S. 462, 475-76 (1985).

A. The Minimum Contacts Requirement is Not Satisfied by Reliance on an Employee's Conduct on Behalf of His Employer

A critical element of this due-process, minimum-contacts analysis is that the exercise of jurisdiction be foreseeable to the defendant; in other words, "the defendant's conduct and connection with the forum State are such that he should reasonably anticipate being haled into court there." *World-Wide Volkswagen Corp. v. Woodson*, 444 U.S. 286, 296 (1980). "[I]n each case . . . there must be some act by which the defendant purposefully avails itself of the privilege of conducting activities within the forum State, thus invoking the benefits and protections of its laws." *Hanson v. Denckla*, 357 U.S. 235, 253 (1958). These requirements "must be met as to each defendant over whom a state court exercises jurisdiction." *Rush v. Savchuk*, 444 U.S. 320, 332 (1980).

These basic elements of minimum contacts are lacking where an employee goes into a forum state to transact business on behalf of his employer, as the contacts are not truly those of the employee, but rather are those of his employer. Because none of the employee defendant's acts in such circumstances are personal acts, they do not amount to the purposeful transaction of business by the defendant as an individual.

Here, just as is the case with most employees conducting negotiations for a corporation, Mr. Pessina never contracted as an individual with a resident of Texas for the performance of a contract in Texas. The agreements at issue were negotiated by Mr. Pessina solely for Alliance Unichem, in his capacity as a corporate representative of Alliance Unichem. Mr. Pessina had no direct beneficial interest in any of the agreements and no personal cause of action in the event of a breach. Mr. Pessina's relationship with, and actions on behalf of, Alliance Unichem were never disguised or misrepresented.

B. Basing Jurisdiction on an Employee's Corporate Conduct Does Not Comport With Traditional Notions of Fair Play and Substantial Justice

Once it is determined that a defendant has purposefully established minimum contacts within the forum state, these contacts must then be considered in light of all other facts to determine whether assertion of personal jurisdiction comports with the due process standard of "fair play and substantial justice." *Int'l Shoe*, 326 U.S. at 320. Determinative factors include the following: (1) the burden on the defendant, (2) the interests of the forum state in adjudicating the dispute, (3) the plaintiff's interest in obtaining convenient and

effective relief, (4) the interstate judicial system's interest in obtaining the most efficient resolution of controversies, and (5) the shared interest of the several states. *Asahi Metal Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Superior Court of Calif.*, 480 U.S. 102, 113 (1987) (citing *World-Wide Volkswagen*, 444 U.S. at 292).

An analysis of the five factors demonstrates the unfairness of exercising personal jurisdiction here. The burden on Mr. Pessina (and any employee in his situation) is severe. The "unique burdens placed upon one," like Mr. Pessina, "who must defend oneself in a foreign legal system," were noted by this Court in *Asahi*. 480 U.S. at 114. Such considerations "should have significant weight in assessing the reasonableness of stretching the long arm of personal jurisdiction over national borders." *Id.* In evaluating the state's interest in adjudicating the dispute, it must be recognized that without imposing the burden of jurisdiction on the individual employee, the dispute can ***still*** be adjudicated—but against a corporate defendant much more equipped to fund and manage the defense of a lawsuit in a faraway and inconvenient forum. More to the point, the dispute will be litigated against the party that did purposefully avail itself of the privilege of doing business in Texas—Alliance Unichem.

The remaining three factors—the plaintiff's interest in obtaining relief, the interests of the interstate judicial system and interests of the several states (or as is the case here, those of other ***nations***)[3]—are similarly influenced by the impact

3. *See Asahi*, 480 U.S. at 115 (indicating that in cases where the defendant is a resident of another nation, "this advice calls for a court to consider the procedural and substantive policies of other *nations* whose interests are affected by the assertion of jurisdiction. . . .") (emphasis in original).

of the presence of a solvent corporate defendant. Declining to exercise jurisdiction under such circumstances will not in any way deny the plaintiff full relief. Moreover, the impact of the fact that jurisdiction over a foreign national is at issue cannot be understated. As this Court stated in *Asahi*:

> The procedural and substantive interests of other nations in a state court's assertion of jurisdiction over an alien defendant will differ from case to case. In every case, however, those interests, as well as the Federal Government's interest in its foreign relations policies, will be best served by a careful inquiry into the reasonableness of the assertion of jurisdiction in the particular case, and an unwillingness to find the serious burdens on an alien defendant outweighed by minimal interests on the part of the plaintiff or the forum State. "***Great care and reserve should be exercised when extending our notions of personal jurisdiction into the international field.***"

480 U.S. at 115 (emphasis added). Such concerns are only compounded when the alien defendant at issue is an individual whose presence in the suit wholly duplicates that of his employer. When full satisfaction of any judgment can be had by suit against the corporation alone, and there are no claims alleged that are particular to the individual employee at issue (all causes of action are alleged against the corporation as well), there is simply no reason to impose the burden of jurisdiction on the individual employee.

II. This Case Squarely Presents the Broader Question Regarding Jurisdiction Over Employees as Individuals Left Open by the Court

A. The Court Should Further Define the Circumstances Under Which an Employee May Reasonably Expect to be Haled Into Court on an Individual Basis

Courts across the country, searching for guidance on this question, have turned to this Court's opinion in *Calder v. Jones*, 465 U.S. 783 (1984). In *Calder*, this Court's analysis turned upon the ultimate inquiry in any personal jurisdiction case: whether the defendant should have reasonably anticipated being haled into court in the forum state. 465 U.S. at 789-90. The defendants in *Calder*—who were professional journalists with the *National Enquirer*, a publication of nationwide circulation having a notable distribution network in California—published an allegedly defamatory article on California actress Shirley Jones. *Id.* at 784. When Ms. Jones sued them in a California court, the journalists claimed that the court lacked jurisdiction over their persons since they were merely a reporter and editor, respectively, for the paper. *Id.* at 789. In doing so, the journalists "liken[ed] themselves to a welder employed in Florida who works on a boiler which subsequently explodes in California." *Id.* This Court's rejection of the defendants' attempted analogy illustrates its reasoning:

> [The journalists'] analogy does not wash. Whatever the status of their hypothetical welder, [the journalists] are not charged with mere untargeted negligence. Rather, their intentional, and allegedly tortious, actions were expressly aimed at California. Petitioner South wrote and

> petitioner Calder edited an article that they knew would have a potentially devastating impact upon [Ms. Jones]. And they knew that the brunt of that injury would be felt by [Ms. Jones] in the State in which she lives and works and in which the National Enquirer has its largest circulation. ***Under the circumstances, [the journalists] must "reasonably anticipate being haled into court there" to answer for the truth of the statements made in their article."***

465 U.S. 789-90 (quoting *World-Wide Volkswagen*, 444 U.S. at 297) (emphasis added). It did not escape the Court's notice that the reporter's personal "byline" appeared on the published article, *id.* at 785, and thus the specific journalistic piece at issue stood to benefit him personally.

With regard to the effect of the individual defendants' status as employees, this Court noted only that it did not "somehow insulate them from jurisdiction" and re-emphasized the fact that "[e]ach defendant's contacts with the forum state must be assessed individually." 465 U.S. at 790 (citations omitted). Far from announcing a *per se* rule that employees should be subjected to individual jurisdiction for contacts arising out of performing their job for a corporation, *Calder* supports the unremarkable proposition that employee actions also possessing an individual (as opposed to purely corporate) character or benefit will not be ignored merely because they are by an employee. When the actions or contacts at issue possess such a personal nature or benefit (even if they also benefit the corporation, as was the case in *Calder*), the exercise of personal jurisdiction is both appropriate and constitutionally permissible. In the instant case, by contrast, Mr. Pessina

did not reasonably expect that he would benefit personally (nor, in fact, did he) from the transactions that are the subject of the suit, or that he would be individually "haled into court" in Texas to answer for claims made against his corporation. There is no benefit in this case (or in most corporate fact scenarios) analogous to the personal byline in *Calder*.

B. This Important Jurisdictional Question Has Been Answered Differently by Various Courts

Whether individual jurisdiction exists over employees for acts taken in their capacity as corporate employees has been the subject of many years of debate in the courts of this country, much of it within the context of a concept referred to as the "fiduciary shield doctrine." *See, e.g., Stuart v. Spademan*, 772 F.2d 1185, 1197-98 (5th Cir. 1985); *Saktides v. Cooper*, 742 F. Supp. 382, 385 (W.D. Tex. 1990) (collecting cases). Properly regarded, the fiduciary shield doctrine is nothing more than a rearticulation of basic principles of due process (see section I, above)[4] and a recognition of the jurisdictional implications of the law of corporations. Corporations can only act through individuals, so the fiduciary shield doctrine seeks to attribute contacts to the party they belong to: when an individual acts solely on behalf

4. Some courts have viewed the fiduciary shield doctrine as part of the analysis to be applied by courts in interpreting state long-arm statutes (rather than as part of the constitutional due process analysis). *See, e.g., Marine Midland Bank v. Miller*, 664 F.2d 899 (2d Cir. 1981) (New York long-arm statute did not extend to the full limits of due process). This is only possible where the state long-arm statute does not extend jurisdiction to the full limits authorized by the Constitution. The Texas long-arm statute has been recognized as extending to the limits of due process. *See, e.g., CSR Ltd. v. Link*, 925 S.W.2d 591, 594 (Tex. 1996); *Shapolsky v. Brewton*, 56 S.W.3d 120, 129 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2001, pet. denied).

of a corporation, his acts and any resulting contacts belong to the corporation, as it is the corporation alone that has benefited from the forum contact.

Two well-established "exceptions" to the fiduciary shield doctrine exist, although in fact they are not really exceptions at all, but just extensions of the idea that if the contacts are not purely corporate, they belong to the individual. These are the personal benefit exception and the alter ego exception. Obviously, where an individual acts to benefit himself rather than his corporation, he is incurring individual contacts with a forum that should not be imputed to his corporation in the jurisdictional analysis. Similarly, when the corporation at issue is nothing but a sham or an alter ego of the individual involved, the contacts belong to the individual rather than the corporation.

A third and perhaps less common exception, the "tort exception," was applied by the Texas Court of Appeals in this case. This exception attributes employee actions that are conducted on behalf of the employer, and allegedly result in a tort, to the employee for jurisdictional purposes.[5] This idea of excepting conduct relating to alleged torts from the protection of the fiduciary shield doctrine makes conceptual sense; but as applied it proves to swallow the rule because of the realities of modern business

5. This is the exception most generally relied upon to distinguish this Court's holding in *Calder* by those courts still attempting to apply the fiduciary shield doctrine. Yet given the unusual facts of *Calder* (the intentional tort at issue was libel, unlikely to arise in a garden variety business dispute), it is easy to see how the law in this area has become distorted; the widespread application of the *Calder* holding to such factually distinct scenarios (such as the business negotiations at issue in this case) further emphasizes the need for this Court to more completely address this issue than was possible in *Calder*.

litigation. Unfortunately, nearly every business dispute today involves allegations of "business torts," like fraud and misrepresentation, and many litigants join as parties the individual employees who simply negotiated the transaction in what would formerly have been a simple breach of contract lawsuit against a corporate defendant only.

A number of state and federal courts have recognized some form of the fiduciary shield doctrine[6] (with varying treatments of the exceptions outlined above), whether by that name or not. *See, e.g., Stuart v. Spademan*, 772 F.2d at 1197-98; *Marine Midland Bank v. Miller*, 664 F.2d 899, 902 (2d Cir. 1981); *Columbia Briargate Co. v. First Nat'l Bank*, 713 F.2d 1052, 1065 (4th Cir. 1983); *Weller v. Cromwell Oil Co.*, 504 F.2d 927, 931 (6th Cir. 1974); *Wilshire Oil Co. v. Riffe*, 409 F.2d 1277, 1281 (10th Cir. 1969); *Hoag v. Sweetwater Int'l*, 857 F. Supp. 1420, 1426 (D. Nev. 1994); *Violanti v. Emery Worldwide*, 847 F. Supp. 1251, 1256 (M.D. Penn. 1994); *McClelland v. Watling Ladder Co.*, 729 F. Supp. 1316, 1320 (W.D. Okla. 1990); *Saktides*, 742 F. Supp. at 385; *Allen v. Toshiba Corp.*, 599 F. Supp. 381, 384 (D.N.M. 1984); *Stuart v. Federal Energy Sys., Inc.*, 596 F. Supp. 458, 461 (D. Vt. 1984); *Idaho Potato Comm'n v. Washington Potato Comm'n*, 410 F. Supp. 171, 182 (D. Idaho 1975); *Flocco v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins.* Co., 752 A.2d 147, 163 (D.C. 2000); *Doe v. Thompson*, 620 So. 2d 1004, 1006 (Fla. 1993); *Rollins v. Ellwood*, 565 N.E.2d 1302, 1318 (Ill. 1990); *Christian Book Distributors, Inc. v. Great Christian Books, Inc.*, 768 A.2d 719, 733-34 (Md. Ct. Spec. App. 2001); *Brown v. General Brick Sales Co.*, 39 S.W.3d 291, 300 (Tex. App.—Ft. Worth 2001, no pet.).

---

6. It should be noted that some of these authorities do so in the context of interpreting the language of the state long-arm statute, and not in the broader context of due process analysis.

An equal or greater number of courts have rejected the concept, instead subjecting employees to individual jurisdiction even though their only contacts with the forum are on behalf of their corporate employers. *See, e.g., Davis v. Metro Productions, Inc.*, 885 F.2d 515, 521 (9th Cir. 1989); *Torchmark Corp. v. Rice*, 945 F. Supp. 172, 176 (E.D. Ark. 1996); *Springs Indus., Inc. v. Gasson*, 923 F. Supp. 823, 826 (D. S.C. 1996); *Superior Consulting Co., Inc. v. Walling*, 851 F. Supp. 839, 844 (E.D. Mich. 1994); *Mobil Oil Corp. v. Advanced Envtl. Recycling Techns., Inc.*, 833 F. Supp. 437, 442-43 (D. Del. 1993); *Seiber v. Campbell*, 810 So. 2d 641, 645 (Ala. 2001); *see also Sudduth v. Howard*, 646 So. 2d 664, 668 (Ala. 1994); *Taylor-Rush v. Multitech Corp.*, 265 Cal. Rptr. 672, 681 (Cal. Ct. App. 1990); *Anderson v. Heartland Oil & Gas, Inc.*, 249 Kan. 458, 492 (Kan. 1991); *Principal Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. Glick*, 1994 WL 878819, at *3 (Mass. Super. Ct. Dec. 14, 1994); *Holste v. Burlington Northern R.R.*, 592 N.W.2d 894, 909 (Neb. 1999); *Estabrook v. Wetmore*, 529 A.2d 956, 957 (N.H. 1987); *Kreutter v. McFadden Oil Corp.*, 522 N.E.2d 40, 47 (N.Y. 1988).

Still other jurisdictions are internally conflicted on the question. *See, e.g., Intermatic Inc. v. Taymac Corp.*, 815 F. Supp. 290, 296 (S.D. Ind. 1993); *but see Ryan v. Chayes Virginia, Inc.*, 553 N.E.2d 1237, 1240 (Ind. Ct. App. 1990); *Aquadrill, Inc. v. Environmental Compliance Consulting Servs., Inc.*, 558 N.W.2d 391, 394 (Iowa 1997); *Whalen v. Connelly*, 545 N.W.2d 284, 295 (Iowa 1996); *State ex rel. Miller v. Baxter Chrysler Plymouth, Inc.*, 456 N.W.2d 371, 378 (Iowa 1990); *but see State ex rel. Miller v. Moneda Corp.*, 1997 Iowa Sup. LEXIS 343, at * 4-5 (Iowa 1997); *Fryar v. Westside Habilitation Ctr.*, 479 So. 2d 883, 890 (La. 1985); *Escoto v. U. S. Lending Corp.*, 675 So. 2d 741, 746 (La. Ct. App. 1996); *but see Office Dimensions—*

Louisiana, Inc. v. King, 718 So. 2d 1052, 1056 (La. Ct. App. 1998); *Oakridge Holdings, Inc. v. Brukman*, 528 N.W.2d 274, 278 (Minn. Ct. App. 1995); *Cantrell v. Extradition Corp. of Am.*, 789 F. Supp. 306, 310 (W.D. Mo. 1992).

C. The Court Should Use This Opportunity to Provide Clarity for Foreign Corporate Employees

The fiduciary shield doctrine has never been reached by this Court, and the jurisprudential void has led to conflicting decisions nationwide, giving rise to much uncertainty in the national and international business community. Foreign employees never quite know whether they are subjecting themselves to the jurisdiction of a given forum simply by conducting their employer's business there. In Arkansas they are, while in Pennsylvania they are not. Allowing a court to assert jurisdiction over a non-resident defendant whose only contact with the state is the conduct of business on behalf of a corporation is contrary to due process, and the failure of U.S. courts to uniformly recognize this fact unquestionably puts a damper on the transaction of international business in this country.[7] This is particularly the case where (as here) the proper defendant, the corporation, has not contested jurisdiction and is solvent and able to pay a judgment that may be obtained in the litigation. If employees are individually required to defend the acts of their employer, what is the function of the corporate form? Such a result is unquestionably unfair and contrary to both the Constitution and the fundamental purpose of a corporation, and should not stand.

---

7. *Cf.* Sonal N. Mehta, *Pavlovich v. Super. Ct. of Santa Clara Cty.*, 17 Berkeley Tech. L.J. 337, 355 (noting in Internet context that increasingly expansive and overbroad definitions of "minimum contacts" and "purposeful direction" will have a "chilling effect" on commerce).

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, Stefano Pessina's Petition for Writ of Certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

BRIAN S. GREIG*
SHERRARD L. HAYES
MARCY HOGAN GREER
REBECCA EDGAR MELTON
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.
600 Congress Avenue, Suite 2400
Austin, Texas 78701
(512) 474-5201

Counsel for Petitioner

* *Counsel of Record*